

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: James A. Ruse, Keith D. Foote, and Kenneth C. Peterson

For: MIRROR WITH BASE BRACKET HAVING INTEGRALLY-MOLDED
REINFORCEMENT

Serial No.: 10/710,941 Examiner: Ricky D. Shafer

Filed: 08/13/2004 Group Art Unit: 3618

Atty. Docket: 71486-0077 Confirmation No: 7940

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope
addressed to the Commissioner for Patents,
PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

☒ transmitted EFS Web filing to the Patent and Trademark Office.

/Christine M. Judge/

Signature

Date: May 8, 2006

Christine M. Judge

(type or print name of person certifying)

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

In response to the Office Action mailed April 7, 2006, kindly amend the above-identified application as follows:

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-48 were in the application as filed. The Examiner has required restriction between alleged patentably distinct inventions, and Applicant has provisionally elected the Examiner's alleged Invention I, claims 2-22. The Examiner has identified the following inventions:

I. Claims 2-22, drawn to an exterior vehicle mirror system comprising a base, a reflective element assembly, a connection and a reinforcing element with particular reinforcing element details of being integrally molded with at least one of the base and the reflective element assembly (Bsp), classified in class 359, subclass 872;

II. Claims 23-48, drawn to an exterior vehicle mirror system comprising a base, a reflective element assembly, a connection, a first reinforcing element associated with the base and a second reinforcing element associated with the reflective element assembly (ABBr), classified in class 359, subclass 872.

The Examiner asserts that claim I is a linking claim. The Examiner also asserts that the inventions are related as a combination (alleged invention II) and a subcombination (alleged invention I).

CONCLUSION

Applicant asserts that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn. However, to comply with the requirements set forth by the Examiner, and only for these reasons, Applicant provisionally elects alleged Invention I, claims 2-22.

If there are any outstanding issues which the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned to resolve these issues. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. RUSE ET AL.

Dated: May 8, 2006

By: /Michael F Kelly/
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
MCGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0226177